

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are requested in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, which place the application into condition for allowance.

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 12, 13, 18-24, 31, 34 and 40 are pending in this application. Claims 12, 13 and 24 are amended; claims 14, 29, 32 and 38 are newly cancelled. Support for the amended claims can be found throughout the specification and from the cancelled claims. No new matter is added.

It is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that these claim are and were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments of the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 or 112; but simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 IS OVERCOME

Claim 12 was rejected under Section 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 12 is amended as suggested by the Examiner, obviating the rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal are requested.

III. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1ST PARAGRAPH, IS OVERCOME

Claims 12-14, 18-24, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38 and 40 were rejected under the first paragraph of Section 112 as allegedly lacking enablement. Solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended to claims to reflect the scope deemed enabled by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the enablement rejection are requested.

IV. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 IS OVERCOME

Claims 12-14 and 20-22 were rejected under Section 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dewhurst *et al.*, further evidenced by Hazan *et al.* In view of the fact that neither reference teaches the use of a lentiviral vector pseudotyped with at least part of a VSV-G protein to transduce mammalian adipose cells, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: Anne-Marie C. Yvon
Thomas J. Kowalski
Reg. No. 32,147

Anne-Marie C. Yvon, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 52,390
(212) 588-0800